UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/500,825	07/07/2004	Harald Hofmann	502902-183PUS	8491
	7590 06/04/200 ΓΑΝΙ, LIEBERMAN &	EXAMINER		
551 FIFTH AVENUE			GRAMLING, SEAN P	
SUITE 1210 NEW YORK, N	NY 10176		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ŕ			2875	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/500,825	HOFMANN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SEAN P. GRAMLING	2875		

	SEAN P. GRAMLING	2875	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 May 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth hter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extractional extractional extractional extraction of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the Notice of Appeal has been filed. 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better	**	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	timely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Sharon E. Payne/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2875	
	,		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding independent claim 1, Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's submission that the plurality of LED's 20, 20' in Calon are not spaced apart from the base. As presented in the previous Office Action. Examiner defined the base of the lamp to be the portion of the lamp which surrounds housing 70 (see Figure 1). Accordingly, Examiner submits that LED's 20, 20' are spaced apart from the base in that there is a distance between the LED's and the base. Examiner also respectfully disagrees with Applicant's submission that LED's 20, 20' are not combined to form one module arranged on the base. The LED's are disposed on a plate which is attached to the base of the lamp (see Figure 1). Examiner submits that the LED's 20, 20' along with the plate are combined to form one module arranged on the base. Lastly, Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's submission that LED's 20, 20' are not aligned in a substantially longitudinal direction of the lamp. As Applicant noted in the current response, "longitudinal" can be defined as "extending in the direction of the length of a thing". In the previous Office Action, Examiner submitted that the length of the lamp can be defined as a distance between two ends of the lamp along the x-direction (when the lamp is viewed in the upright position as illustrated in Figure 1), which is the direction that LED's 20, 20' are aligned with. Although Applicant has offered one definition of the word "length" to be "the longest extent of anyting as measured from end to end", Examiner submits that the word "length" is also defined as "a measured distance" (see Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2005, p. 282, entry 1). Accordingly, Examiner submits that the distance between two end points of the lamp along the x-direction (when viewed in the upright position as illustrated in Figure 1) is "a measured distance", and that the LED's 20, 20' extend in the direction of this length. The rejections of claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 17-24 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) are therefore maintained.